

THURLBY PARISH COUNCIL

Clerk to the Council

Bernard Champness
5 Woodside East,
Northorpe,
Bourne, Lincs
PE10 0HT
Tel: 01778 393431
clerk@thurlbyparishcouncil.gov.uk

26 October 2026

South Kesteven District Council
Council Offices
St Peter's Hill
Grantham
Lincs
NG31 6PZ

Dear Sir,

Re: Letter of Objection to S26/1653

I am writing with regard to the above planning application on behalf of Thurlby Parish Council which we were able to discuss at a meeting on 19 October 2026. That meeting was attended by 67 parishioners the vast majority of which were opposed to the application. We also facilitated a public meeting on 24 September 2026 prior to the planning application being lodged when almost 90 people were in attendance.

Having considered the application, Thurlby Parish Council objects to this application, and we wish to set out our objections to this matter below:

1. The application is for outline approval of the erection of at least 90 houses. If and once approved the applicant will then lodge another application for full planning permission for possibly more houses than mentioned in this application and the actual layout to be completely different to the one set out now. The only part of the application which is not outline planning permission is the exit/access to and from the site. We will deal with that aspect later
2. The application is contrary to TNP09, TPN10 and TPN11 of the Thurlby and Northorpe Neighbourhood Plan.
3. Both TNP09 and TNP10 state that new development will only be approved if it will not involve the outward extension of the village into areas of open countryside and that it is within the existing village curtilage of Thurlby and Northorpe. Likewise, TNP10 states that there should be no loss of agriculturally productive land Grade 1 and 2, and Grade 3a, unless it can be clearly demonstrated that there are no other more sustainable sites available. This application does not fit any of these criteria and there clearly are other sites within the village that do. We would also refer to the National Planning Policy Framework and in particular National decision-making policies GB6: Control of development in the Green Belt which states:
 1. Development in the Green Belt is inappropriate unless it falls within one of the categories in policy GB7.
 2. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Such circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm resulting from the proposed development, is clearly outweighed by other considerations. In making this

assessment, substantial weight should be given to the harm to the Green Belt which would be caused, including harm to its openness.

3. In the case of proposals for renewable and low carbon energy development, very special circumstances may include the wider environmental benefits associated with increased production of energy from renewable sources.

4. This site is not and has never been included within the South Kesteven Local Plan for potential development.

TNP09 and TNP10 both state that any development must ensure existing sewerage and highways infrastructure has sufficient capacity or has been upgraded prior to occupation of the development. This criterion has once again not been met. The existing sewage system has not been upgraded since it was installed more than 50 years ago. It is at full capacity and now with an expected increase in the size of the village we will have in excess of 200 more residents. According to the most recent census there were 2143 residents in Thurlby so another 200 is an increase of 10% which is not a trivial number for the village to absorb. We therefore believe it should not even be up for consideration

5. This will only result in the entire sewage system failing. We were once told that we could expect a once in every 10 years or more storms where flooding would take place. This prediction has been proved wrong and almost every year we have a heavy storm. On each occasion raw sewage has flowed from manhole covers into the gardens of residents in various locations around the village. It is likely this will happen whether or not there is a heavy rainstorm should this development take place. The Applicant we believe would need to potentially spend in excess of £2m to upgrade this system to a satisfactory level before any development is even considered

6. The highways infrastructure is also inadequate and needs upgrading. With the increase in traffic the road will need widening. The entrance/exit to and from the site is onto the A15 a busy main road and will be close to the Maths Woods and a sharp S bend. Pedestrians will have to walk to the bus stop at Northorpe along the busy road and the existing footpath is inadequate and is not possible to widen the path without it being right next to the kerb or close to a dyke. There are no streetlights from the crossroads at Northorpe to the entrance/exit to the site which will mean that pedestrians, many of whom will be young children will have to walk along a dark footpath close to a busy main road with traffic travelling at 40 mph. This will be far from ideal or safe for the people using the footpath. To make matters worse the path will also be used by cyclists which will make it even more hazardous for pedestrians.

7. The development is out of character to the existing area and has no direct access to the village other than using the single vehicular access onto the A15 and then travelling along the A15 to turn into Northorpe or Thurlby, thus increasing traffic on an already busy and dangerous road. This means that the development will be a totally isolated part of the village and therefor will not be part of the existing community. Should the development be allowed to proceed then there will be the loss of the horseshoe shape of the villages. Please see Part 7 on the Village Character Assessment which clearly sets out the need to retain the horseshoe shape"

8. It is proposed that there will be up to 204 car parking spaces within the development. All vehicles will only have access onto the A15 which is already busy hence the need to improve the road. We would like to mention that the planning submission used A15 census from 2011 (15 years ago) and is out of date and not representative of the current congestion and traffic on the road, especially at rush hour. During rush hour the traffic on the northbound approach to Bourne roundabout backs up almost to the proposed site and indeed beyond that to Northorpe on some occasions.

9. The development is next to an SSSI site being the Math and Elsea Woods. It is understood to be one of 30 SSSI sites within Lincolnshire. The development will have an adverse effect upon the wildlife within the woods. It is occupied by a herd of deer as well as Muntjac as well as other birds and creatures. The application seems to acknowledge that the wildlife needs to be protected and are taking minimum steps to prevent any wildlife being affected. These steps are inadequate

and the planning application refused not just because of the wildlife but because of all the other reasons we have stated. It is understood that the woods are home to bats which hunt across the proposed development. One particular species has been identified as barbastelle bats which incredibly rare

10. To assist us in our objections we would refer to the planning application in the 1990's relating to planning on the 2 fields to the west of this site. This matter went to a full hearing in Bourne when Barristers were instructed and after a 4-day hearing the application was refused. This was based on the closeness to the Maths & Elsea Woods as well as it retaining a distinct gap between Northorpe and Bourne without which Northorpe would become a suburb of Bourne. We would also rely on the recent decisions in Bourne when planning was refused on land to the west of Raymond May Way because of the close proximity to the SSI site and the wildlife within the woods. Particular mention was made of the barbastelle bats and there was serious concern regarding disturbance and loss of wildlife corridors. The other application that was refused was S25/2469 as it was again close to Bourne Woods.

11. Whilst mentioning S25/2469 it is noted that in the refusal notification the applicant refused to enter into a Sec 106 agreement to secure the necessary affordable housing and open space, together with contributions to education, healthcare, and highways improvements. This is most relevant to this particular application as we would seek such a sec 106 agreement to ensure the developers pays for the necessary work to improve the highways, provide money for education, as there are no spaces available at the school in Thurlby and or the schools in Bourne, that money is made available for healthcare provision as there is little if any available places at the Dr's or Dentists in Bourne. We would also want the developers to pay for the upgrading of the entire sewage system either from their own funds or Sec 106 monies.

12. To the west of the site are 2 large and ancient oak trees which need to be protected and preserved. It is not that at this stage houses will be built very close to those trees and it may will be that in the future the roots of these trees will cause damage to the foundations on the properties. There is a dyke running behind Woodside East and Woodside Close which has Riparian rights. If development were to take place who would be responsible for maintaining the dyke which runs along the edge of the site.

The Key Riparian Responsibilities are not only for the householders but also whoever owns the land on the other side of the dyke.

Maintain Flow: Both must keep the watercourse clear of natural or man-made blockages, fallen trees, and debris that could cause flooding.

Prevent Pollution: Both are responsible for ensuring waste, sewage, or harmful chemicals do not enter the watercourse.

Manage Banks and Vegetation: Both must maintain the stability of the banks and control invasive non-native plant species (such as Japanese Knotweed or Giant Hogweed).

Accept Natural Flow: Both must allow water to flow downstream without diverting or obstructing it to the detriment of neighbours

These responsibilities cannot fall only to the householders along Woodside East. We have mentioned that we would have storms that happen once in a 10-year cycle. In the last few years, the dyke was full, not because of the water on the field but because of water running down from the village and as a result there was flooding to the houses on Bourne Road as well as flooding at the Northorpe Crossroads. The proposed pond on the site will not in any way affect the amount of water running down from the village as all it will do is to drain water from the site. However, this does not mean that the pond will not become completely full and overflow with that extra water having to go somewhere.

In view of our objections, we would ask that this application is “called in” and that the planning committee have a site visit to see for themselves the detrimental effect that allowing this application to proceed would have on Northorpe and Thurlby.

Kind regards

B M Champness

Bernard M Champness

Clerk

[www: thurlby.parish.lincolnshire.gov.uk](http://www.thurlby.parish.lincolnshire.gov.uk)